

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE

Tuesday, March 17, 1998
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Ocotillo Conference Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

John Anderson for Patrick McDermott, Chandler, Chairman	Steve Hancock, Mesa
Mark Mansfield, ADOT	Tracy Stevens, Peoria
*Mario Mangiamale, Gilbert	John Siefert, Phoenix
Susan Bookspan, Glendale	Maureen Mageau-DeCindis, RPTA
*Larry Martinez, Goodyear	Amy MacAulay, Scottsdale
*Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Aaron Iverson, Maricopa County	

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dawn Coomer, MAG	Sharon Sargent-Flack, Surprise
John Farry, MAG	

1. Call to Order

John Anderson called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

2. Approval of the February 17, 1998 Meeting Minutes

John Siefert moved to approve the meeting minutes, Maureen Mageau-DeCindis seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

There were no members of the public present to address the Task Force.

4. Modal Representation on the Transportation Review Committee (TRC)

John Farry addressed the committee to inform them of the status of modal representation on the TRC. After reviewing the background of this issue, John noted that the item was approved by the Management committee and will go to the Regional Council next week. Susan Bookspan asked why members would be ex-officio, and John responded that members would be non-voting due to complications arising from jurisdictions having more than one vote.

5. Review of Adopted Goals and Objectives

Dawn Coomer addressed the committee, noting that the adopted goals and objectives have been included as an attachment to the meeting agenda. She added that this chapter would provide the foundation for the working paper to be written after the completion of Task One of the MAG Regional Bicycle Plan Update. Changes already approved by the committee, but not yet heard by Regional Council, had been noted as strikeout or highlighted text as appropriate. Steve Hancock noted that he did not recall the changes being approved by the Task Force, but that he did not have any problems with the changes as they appeared in the attachment. The committee discussed how the changes should be formally approved. Susan Bookspan noted that it would be important to have a complete document ready to be approved by Regional Council, rather than approving the Update in a piecemeal fashion.

6. Assessment of Goals and Objectives

Dawn Coomer addressed the committee, referring to attachment two. She noted that the goal of the attachment was to show how the issues identified by the Task Force were addressed in the adopted goals and objectives. For each goal and objective, issues identified by the Task Force were listed to determine which issues were adequately addressed by the goals and objectives. Susan Bookspan noted that this format was helpful, and could be included in the final working paper as a way for local jurisdictions to identify problems and potential solutions used to address those problems. She added that the final plan update should be as user-friendly as possible. Steve Hancock added that perhaps issues and needs could have a separate chapter in the update.

The committee continued to discuss the goals and objectives, and how they could be modified to adequately address issues. Major points included making the objectives more global in scope, the need for consistent signing and stripping across jurisdictions, removing references to recreation from the plan, and including the word “mobility” as a key component. The committee also agreed that wide curb lanes do not encourage ridership, and should be removed from all areas of the plan. A new objective was recommended: “Design an infrastructure to serve mobility needs for all types of cyclists on both long- and short-distance trips.” Engineering objective five was noted for being design-oriented. The committee also suggested that objectives be reorganized based on the issues identified. The need for bicycle lanes on collector streets was seen as important to include in engineering objective six, as well as noting that “connecting destinations on collectors and arterials” was important.

The Task Force then focused attention on how to address issues and needs not adequately addressed by adopted goals and objectives, as listed in the last table of attachment two. John Anderson noted that

updating the bike map biennially should be a separate objective. Evaluation of funding criteria will occur in later tasks. Consideration of Title VI issues would be handled in a manner similar to the Long Range Transportation Plan by making reference to these concerns in the issues and needs chapter. Amy MacAulay noted that many low-income persons used bicycle facilities in Scottsdale. Analysis of opportunities and constraints could occur in a chapter similar to the issues and needs chapter. Identification of highly traveled corridors was discussed extensively by the Task Force. Members noted that high activity areas were considered in local plans, that high travel corridors could be identified by examining the location of major activity centers, and that a major constraint is not having adequate numbers of bicycle trips in these corridors. The Task Force agreed that this issue could not be adequately addressed at this time due to resource constraints.

Discussion concluded by staff agreeing to update the goals and objectives with Task Force input, and providing an updated chapter for the next meeting.

7. Next Meeting Date and Time

Due to new scheduling constraints, the Task Force will now be meeting on the third Tuesday of each month at 1:00 p.m. rather than 10:00 a.m. as previously done. This change will be effective with the next meeting on April 21, 1998.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.